

2822



COPY OF PAPERS
ORIGINALLY FILED

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant: Leonard Forbes

Title: SILICON-GERMANIUM DEVICES FOR CMOS FORMED BY ION IMPLANTATION AND SOLID PHASE EPITAXIAL REGROWTH

Docket No.: 303.229US2

Serial No.: 09/132,157

Filed: August 11, 1998

Due Date: May 26, 2002

Examiner: Mark V. Prenty

Group Art Unit: 2822


Commissioner for Patents
Washington, D.C. 20231

We are transmitting herewith the following attached items (as indicated with an "X"):

- ☒ A return postcard.
- ☒ An Amendment and Response (5 Pages).

Please consider this a **PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME** for sufficient number of months to enter these papers and please charge any additional required fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0743.

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.
P.O. Box 2938, Minneapolis, MN 55402 (612-373-6900)

By: 
Atty: David C. Peterson
Reg. No. 47,857

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail, in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, Washington, D.C. 20231, on this 28th day of May, 2002.

Name: Amy Moriarty

Signature: Amy Moriarty

Customer Number 21186

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.
(GENERAL)

P.O. Box 2938, Minneapolis, MN 55402 (612-373-6900)

S/N 09/132,157

PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant: Leonard Forbes

Examiner: Mark V. Prenty

Serial No.: 09/132,157

Group Art Unit: 2822

Filed: August 11, 1998

Docket: 303.229US2

Title: SILICON-GERMANIUM DEVICES FOR CMOS FORMED BY ION
IMPLANTATION AND SOLID PHASE EPITAXIAL REGROWTH

AMENDMENT AND RESPONSE UNDER 37 CFR § 1.111

Commissioner for Patents
Washington, D.C. 20231

COPY OF PAPERS
ORIGINALLY FILED



33 | Response
6/26/02
A. Waller
RECEIVED
JUN 17 2002
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800

Applicant has reviewed the Office Action mailed on February 26, 2002. Please amend the above-identified patent application as follows.

REMARKS

Applicant has carefully reviewed and considered the Office Action mailed on February 26, 2002, and the references cited therewith.

No claims are amended; as a result, claims 11, 13, 14, 24-28, 32 and 38-43 remain pending in this application. The Examiner has stated in the pending Office Action that "There is nothing patentable in this application." Applicant respectfully traverses this assertion for the following reasons.

§102/ §103 Rejections of the Claims

Claims 11, 14, 24, 25, 28, 32, 38, 40, and 41 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by, or in the alternative, under 35 USC § 103(a) as obvious over Selvakumar et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,426,069).

Claims 13, 26, 27, 39, 42, and 43 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Selvakumar et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,426,069) together with Crabbe' et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,821,577).

Claims 11, 14, 24, 25, 28, 32, 38, 40, and 41 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by, or in the alternative, under 35 USC § 103(a) as obvious over Nakagawa (U.S. Patent No. 5,272,365).